

BASF 6.9.1.1



Nick Zilka
<nzilka@nidlink.com>

11/08/2001 07:48 AM

To: Marykay Voytilla/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc:

Subject: Re: Mine water ROD amendment

Using the language (in some form) in Jim's response would be fine with me. When in the past it was HDS is not as important as is the fact that it was. Again, I think it helps our case if the public (especially Ron Roizon) knows that we are not doing something entirely new. We are merely configuring the plant in a manner that it has been in the past using modern equipment.

Voytilla.Marykay@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Nick,
> Please see Jim's note below regarding your comment on the draft ROD
> Amendment about the CTP originally being in an HDS mode. Based on Jim's
> note, I'm not planning on making the change you requested to the ROD
> Amendment. Let me know if you have any concerns about that. Your other
> suggestions have been incorporated. Thanks.

> Mary Kay

> ----- Forwarded by Marykay Voytilla/R10/USEPA/US on 11/07/2001 01:50 PM

> -----

> "Stefanoff,
> Jim/SPK"

To: Marykay

Voytilla/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

> <jstefano@ch2
> m.com>

cc:

Subject: RE: Mine water ROD

amendment

> 10/29/2001
> 11:30 AM

> Hi--please see my insert to one of Nicks comments below:

> -the CTP filters were not original--they were added when the discharge
> requirements for metals changed from dissolved to total.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Voytilla.Marykay@epamail.epa.gov
> [mailto:Voytilla.Marykay@epamail.epa.gov]
> Sent: October 29, 2001 10:02 AM
> To: Stefanoff, Jim/SPK
> Subject: Mine water ROD amendment

> ----- Forwarded by Marykay Voytilla/R10/USEPA/US on 10/29/2001 10:01 AM

> -----

> Nick Zilka



> <nzilka@nidli To: Marykay
> Voytilla/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> nk.com> cc: Hanson
> <rhanson@deq.state.id.us>, Moss
> <cmoss@dfm.state.id.us>
>
> 10/24/2001 Subject: Mine water ROD
> amendment
> 11:46 AM
>
> The State of Idaho IDEQ team has the following:
>
> >From Chuck:
> The CDA Tribe commented/asked "EPA is now operating the treatment plant;
> how long will this continue and when will the State of Idaho assume the
> lead role?" Is this answered in the ROD Amendment? If so how? What
> will the response to comment be?
>
> >From Rob:
> Nothing as of this moment.
>
> >From Nick:
> P.5,7,13,.....: It is stated that either the CTP has not been upgraded
> or will be upgraded. I think it would help our case if at least in one
> place it is stated that the CTP was originally built in a HDS
> configuration with filters- -the filters were not original--they were
> added
> when the discharge requirements for metals changed from dissolved to
> total. Historically, it was "downgraded" and we
> are essentially putting it back in its original form. The upgrades are
> just state-of-the-art repairs.
> P.6: It says USBM studies were 1994-1998. Not a big deal but the
> studies were 1994-1996. It took DOE 2 years to get the final report out
> after USBM ceased to exist in 1996.
> Sec. 5.1, first bullet: Sentence needs to be rewritten.
> p.7 says Phil Sheridan work was in 1960's. P.21 says 1950's. 1950's is
> correct.